

March 2007

On meta-stable SQCD with adjoint matter and gauge mediation

A. Amariti¹, L. Girardello² and A. Mariotti³

*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca
and INFN, Sezione di Milano-Bicocca, piazza delle Scienze 3, I 20126 Milano, Italy*

ABSTRACT

We briefly review our analysis of a model with non supersymmetric vacua in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ gauge theories with adjoint matter and no R-symmetry. We show here that this model without any modification fits into a direct gauge mediation scenario and leads to massive gauginos.

Contribution to the proceedings of the RTN project ‘Constituents, Fundamental Forces and Symmetries of the Universe’ conference in Napoli, October 9 - 13, 2006.

¹antonio.amariti@mib.infn.it

²luciano.girardello@mib.infn.it

³alberto.mariotti@mib.infn.it

1 Introduction

Following the strategy of the ISS model [1] many examples of dynamical supersymmetry breaking in metastable vacua have been studied in supersymmetric $\mathcal{N} = 1$ gauge theories [2, 3, 4, 5] and in string theory [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. The approach of ISS relies on theories for which Seiberg-like dualities exist, i.e. the IR strong dynamics of the electric theory can be studied perturbatively in the dual magnetic theory in the range where it is weakly coupled.

In [5] we studied a SQCD-like model with $SU(N)$ gauge group and adjoint fields with non trivial superpotential. Models with adjoint fields exhibit richer structure. In [3, 5] it has been necessary to add gauge singlet deformations in order to stabilize the non supersymmetric vacuum. These models show classical landscape of vacua parametrized by the adjoint vevs that can [5] or cannot [3] be wiped out at quantum level.

In the ISS [1] model the fundamental fields are massive with mass lower than the natural scale, while in [2, 3] the fundamental fields are massless. In [5] we considered massive fundamental matter but we will show that our previous results are valid in the limit of vanishing quark masses.

The ISS model and its generalizations can have phenomenological applications in connection with gauge mediation of dynamical supersymmetry breaking to the standard model sector [14, 15]. R-symmetry plays here a relevant role since a $U(1)$ R-symmetry, even broken to Z_n , forbids a gaugino mass generation. To obtain a gaugino mass, deformations can be added to the superpotential making the R-symmetry trivial, and this might require a further careful analysis of its stability. Quite recently, meta-stable models have been analysed in this direction [16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22]. In most cases extra terms, breaking R-symmetry, have been added to known models of dynamical supersymmetry breaking, leading to gaugino mass at 1 loop at the first or at the third order in the breaking scale.

Our model [5], which has meta-stable vacua, is rather non generic (in the sense of [23]), it has no R-symmetry and it is suitable for direct gauge mediation. We show, indeed, that a gaugino mass gets generated at 1 loop at third order in the breaking parameter.

2 $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD with adjoint matter

We consider $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric $SU(N_c)$ Yang Mills theory coupled to N_f massive flavours $(Q_\alpha^i, \tilde{Q}^{j\beta})$ in the fundamental and antifundamental representations of the gauge group $(\alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, N_c)$ and in the antifundamental and fundamental representations of the flavour group $(i, j = 1, \dots, N_f)$, respectively. We also consider a charged chiral massive adjoint superfield X_β^α with superpotential⁴

$$W_{el} = \frac{g_X}{3} \text{Tr} X^3 + \frac{m_X}{2} \text{Tr} X^2 + \lambda_X \text{Tr} X \quad (1)$$

⁴(Tr) means tracing on the color indices, while (tr) on the flavour ones.

where λ_X is a Lagrange multiplier enforcing the tracelessness condition $\text{Tr} X = 0$. This theory is asymptotically free in the range $N_f < 2N_c$ and it admits stable vacua for $N_f > \frac{N_c}{2}$ [24]. The matching between the microscopic scale (Λ) and the macroscopic scale ($\tilde{\Lambda}$) is

$$\Lambda^{2N_c - N_f} \tilde{\Lambda}^{2\tilde{N} - N_f} = \left(\frac{\mu}{g_X} \right)^{2N_f}. \quad (2)$$

where the intermediate scale μ takes into account the mass dimension of the mesons in the dual description.

We add to the electric potential (1) the gauge singlet deformations

$$\Delta W_{el} = \lambda_Q \text{tr} QX\tilde{Q} + m_Q \text{tr} Q\tilde{Q} + h \text{tr} (Q\tilde{Q})^2 \quad (3)$$

The first two terms are standard deformations of the electric superpotential that do not spoil the duality relations (e.g. the scale matching condition (2)) [25]. The last term of (3) can be thought as originating from a second largely massive adjoint field Z in the electric theory with superpotential

$$W_Z = m_Z \text{Tr} Z^2 + \text{Tr} ZQ\tilde{Q} \quad (4)$$

and which has been integrated out. The mass m_Z has to be considered larger than Λ_{2A} , the strong scale of the electric theory with two adjoint fields. This procedure leads to the scale matching relation

$$\Lambda_{2A}^{N_c - N_f} = \Lambda_{1A}^{2N_c - N_f} m_Z^{-N_c} \quad (5)$$

where Λ_{2A} and Λ_{1A} are the strong coupling scales before and after the integration of the adjoint field Z . The other masses in this theory have to be considered much smaller than the strong scale: $\Lambda_{2A} \gg m_Q, m_X$. We can suppose that when $h = \frac{1}{m_z}$ is small the duality relations are still valid.

The dual theory [24, 25, 26] is $SU(2N_f - N_c \equiv \tilde{N})$ with N_f magnetic flavours ($q, \tilde{q}$), a magnetic adjoint field Y and two gauge singlets build from electric mesons ($M_1 = Q\tilde{Q}$, $M_2 = QX\tilde{Q}$), with magnetic superpotential

$$\begin{aligned} W_{magn} = & \frac{\tilde{g}_Y}{3} \text{Tr} Y^3 + \frac{\tilde{m}_Y}{2} \text{Tr} Y^2 + \tilde{\lambda}_Y \text{Tr} Y - \frac{1}{\mu^2} \text{tr} \left(\frac{\tilde{m}_Y}{2} M_1 q \tilde{q} + \tilde{g}_Y M_2 q \tilde{q} + \tilde{g}_Y M_1 q Y \tilde{q} \right) \\ & + \lambda_Q \text{tr} M_2 + m_Q \text{tr} M_1 + h \text{tr} (M_1)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

For this dual theory the scale matching relation is the same as (2) with $\Lambda \equiv \Lambda_{1A}$ defined in (5).

We consider the range where the magnetic theory is IR free and it admits stable vacua

$$\frac{N_c}{2} < N_f < \frac{2}{3} N_c \quad \Rightarrow \quad 0 < 2\tilde{N} < N_f \quad (7)$$

In this range the metric on the moduli space is smooth around the origin [1], and the Kahler potential is regular and can be considered canonical.

3 Non supersymmetric meta-stable vacua

Rescaling the fields and the coupling the superpotential (6) is

$$W_{magn} = \frac{g_Y}{3} \text{Tr} Y^3 + \frac{m_Y}{2} \text{Tr} Y^2 + \lambda_Y \text{Tr} Y + \text{tr} (h_1 M_1 q \tilde{q} + h_2 M_2 q \tilde{q} + h_3 M_1 q Y \tilde{q}) - h_1 m_1^2 \text{tr} M_1 - h_2 m_2^2 \text{tr} M_2 + m_3 \text{tr} M_1^2 \quad (8)$$

Solving the equations of motion we find the supersymmetry breaking tree level vacua:

$$q = \begin{pmatrix} m_2 e^\theta \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{N}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \tilde{q}^T = \begin{pmatrix} m_2 e^{-\theta} \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{N}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \langle Y \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \mathbf{1}_{n_1} & 0 \\ 0 & y_2 \mathbf{1}_{n_2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

Where y_i are functions of n_1 and $n_2 = \tilde{N} - n_1$ as in [5]. We choose the vacuum in which the magnetic gauge group is not broken by the adjoint field $n_1 = 0$, which implies $y_2 = 0$, so $\langle Y \rangle = 0$. In this case we have

$$\langle M_1 \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} p_1^A & 0 \\ 0 & p_1^B \end{pmatrix} \quad \langle M_2 \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} p_2^A & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{X} \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

where the explicit expressions can be found in [5]. The two non trivial blocks of the mesons are respectively $\tilde{N}$ and $N_f - \tilde{N}$ diagonal squared matrices.

Supersymmetry is broken at tree level by the rank condition, i.e. the F equations of motion of M_2 field cannot be all satisfied

$$0 \neq F_{M_2} = F_{\mathcal{X}} = h_2 m_2^2 \quad (11)$$

The minimum of the scalar potential in this tree level vacuum is then different from zero, and results proportional to $|F_{M_2}|^2$. The potential energy of the vacuum does not depend on θ and $\mathcal{X}$; they are massless fields at tree level, not protected by any symmetry and hence are pseudo-moduli.

In [5] the detailed study of the 1-loop quantum corrections to the effective potential has been performed. These corrections depend on the choice of the adjoint vev $\langle Y \rangle$: they are minimized by the choice $\langle Y \rangle = 0$. This is a true quantum minimum of the scalar potential where the pseudomoduli get positive mass squared from the Coleman-Weinberg potential. The field $\mathcal{X}$ gets a non trivial vacuum expectation value from the quantum corrections, $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle \neq 0$, moving slightly the minimum away from the origin.

We report the masses for the pseudomoduli in the regime of small $\rho = \frac{h_1}{h_2}$ and small $\zeta = \frac{h_1^2 m_1^2}{2 h_2 m_2 m_3}$ ($\eta = \frac{2 m_3}{h_2 m_2}$ has been neglected as in [5])

$$m_{\mathcal{X}}^2 = \frac{\tilde{N}(N_f - \tilde{N})}{8\pi^2} |h_2 m_2|^2 \left(|h_2|^2 (\log[4] - 1) + |h_1|^2 (\log[4] - 2) \right)$$

$$m_{\tilde{\theta}}^2 = \frac{\tilde{N}(N_f - \tilde{N})}{16\pi^2} |h_2 m_2|^2 \left(|h_2|^2 (\log[4] - 1) + \left| \frac{h_1^2 m_1^2}{2 m_2 m_3} \right|^2 \left(\log[4] - \frac{5}{3} \right) + |h_1|^2 (2 \log[4] - 3) \right)$$

Other choices for $\langle Y \rangle$ with $n_1 \neq 0 \neq n_2$ would not change the tree level potential energy of the vacua, so there is a landscape of vacua at classical level. This is wiped out by 1-loop corrections. We can give more details about the computation in the case where $n_1 \neq 0$ and how we excluded the possibility of a landscape at quantum level. We parametrize the fluctuations around the non supersymmetric vacua in the case of non trivial vev for the adjoint field

$$q = \begin{pmatrix} ke^\theta + \xi_1 \\ \phi_1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \tilde{q}^T = \begin{pmatrix} ke^{-\theta} + \xi_2 \\ \phi_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \langle Y \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 & 0 \\ 0 & y_2 \end{pmatrix} + \delta Y \quad (12)$$

$$M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} p_1^A + \xi_3 & \phi_3 \\ \phi_4 & p_1^B + \xi_4 \end{pmatrix} \quad M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} p_2^A + \xi_5 & \phi_5 \\ \phi_6 & \mathcal{X} \end{pmatrix} \quad (13)$$

The resulting superpotential for the sector affected by the supersymmetry breaking (the ϕ_i chiral fields) is

$$W = h_2 (\mathcal{X} \phi_1 \phi_2 - m_2^2 \mathcal{X}) + h_2 m_2 (e^\theta \phi_2 \phi_5 + e^{-\theta} \phi_1 \phi_6) + \\ + (h_1 + h_3 y_i) m_2 (e^\theta \phi_2 \phi_3 + e^{-\theta} \phi_1 \phi_4) + 2m_3 \phi_3 \phi_4 + \frac{h_1 m_1^2}{2m_3} (h_1 + h_3 y_i) \phi_1 \phi_2 \quad (14)$$

where $i = 1, 2$. Exactly we have n_1 copies of (14) with $i = 1$ and $\tilde{N} - n_1$ copies with $i = 2$. The fields appearing in (14) are the only ones which contribute to the one loop potential.

Comparing with the one in [5], we observe that having $n_1 \neq 0$ contributes only in a shift in the ζ and ρ parameters. We can then compute the 1-loop quantum corrections to the scalar potential $V^{1-loop}(n_1)$, which depends non trivially on n_1 through $y_i(n_1)$. This contribution is minimized when $n_1 = 0$, i.e. $\langle Y \rangle = 0$, implying that this is the lowest energy vacuum [5].

4 Decay to the supersymmetric vacuum

Supersymmetry is restored when the $SU(\tilde{N})$ symmetry is gauged via non perturbative effects [27], away from the metastable vacuum in the field space. The non supersymmetric vacuum is then a metastable state of the theory which decays into a supersymmetric one. In [5] we find a supersymmetric vacuum in the large field region for the meson M_2 where

$$\langle h_2 M_2 \rangle = \tilde{\Lambda} \epsilon^{\frac{\tilde{N}}{N_f - \tilde{N}}} \xi^{\frac{\tilde{N}}{N_f - \tilde{N}}} \mathbf{1}_{N_f} = m_2 \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right)^{\frac{N_f - 2\tilde{N}}{N_f - \tilde{N}}} \xi^{\frac{\tilde{N}}{N_f - \tilde{N}}} \mathbf{1}_{N_f}, \quad \epsilon = \frac{m_2}{\tilde{\Lambda}} \quad \xi = \frac{m_2}{m_Y}. \quad (15)$$

ϵ is a dimensionless parameter which can be made parametrically small sending the Landau pole $\tilde{\Lambda}$ to infinity. ξ is a dimensionless finite parameter which does not spoil the estimation of the supersymmetric vacuum in the sensible range $\epsilon < \frac{1}{\xi}$. All the exponents appearing in (15) are positive in the window (7).

We observe that in the small ϵ limit the vev $\langle h_2 M_2 \rangle$ is larger than the mass scale m_2 of the magnetic theory but much smaller than the scale $\tilde{\Lambda}$

$$m_2 \ll \langle h_2 M_2 \rangle \ll \tilde{\Lambda}. \quad (16)$$

making the evaluation of the supersymmetric vacuum reliable.

We now make a qualitative evaluation of the decay rate of the metastable vacuum. At semi classical level the decay probability is proportional to e^{-S_B} where S_B is the bounce action from the non supersymmetric vacuum to a supersymmetric one. We obtain as the decay rate [5]

$$S \sim \left(\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right)^{\frac{N_f - 2\tilde{N}}{N_f - \tilde{N}}} \xi^{\frac{\tilde{N}}{N_f - \tilde{N}}} \right)^4 \sim \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right)^{4 \frac{N_f - 2\tilde{N}}{N_f - \tilde{N}}} \quad (17)$$

This rate can be made parametrically large sending to zero the dimensionless ratio ϵ (i.e. sending $\tilde{\Lambda} \rightarrow \infty$) since the exponent $\left(4 \frac{2\tilde{N} - N_f}{\tilde{N} - N_f} \right)$ is always positive in the window (7).

5 Massless quarks

The non supersymmetric meta-stable vacua survive the limit $m_Q \rightarrow 0$. Indeed this limit corresponds in the magnetic description to send to zero the linear term for M_1 , i.e. $m_1 \rightarrow 0$, and all the results are smooth in this limit.

At classical level there are only small differences in the field vacuum expectation values. At quantum level this limit set the parameter ζ to zero, but the qualitative behaviour of the 1-loop corrections is the same: the classical flat directions are still lifted.

Finally the computation of the supersymmetric vacuum for $m_1 = 0$ is even more straightforward, giving a vanishing vacuum expectation values for the meson M_1 . The lifetime estimation of the non-supersymmetric vacuum is not affected by this limit, and it is still parametrically large.

Setting $m_1 = 0$ the model become more similar to the one studied in [3].

6 R-symmetry and gauge mediation

We are interested in direct gauge mediated supersymmetry breaking. In this framework the gauge group of the SM has to be embedded into a flavour group of the dynamical sector. The gauge sector of the SM directly couples to the supersymmetry breaking dynamics and a natural question for model building is whether the gauginos of the MSSM acquire masses.

We can embed the SM gauge group into the subgroups of the flavour symmetry $SU(2N_f - N_c)$ or $SU(N_c - N_f)$ provide $(2N_f - N_c > 5)$ or $(N_c - N_f > 5)$, respectively. As in [18] we can compute the beta function coefficient $b_{SU(3)}$ at different renormalization scales and we conclude that in order to avoid Landau pole problems the embedding should be done in $SU(2N_f - N_c)$.

The full model has no R-symmetry, and, unlike [1, 3], no accidental R-symmetry arises at the non-supersymmetric meta-stable vacuum, and hence a gaugino mass generation is not forbidden [1]. Moreover the absence of R-symmetry implies that the non supersymmetric minimum is not at the origin of the moduli space, i.e. $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle \neq 0$.

The R -breaking terms are the quadratic massive terms $\phi_1\phi_2$ and $\phi_3\phi_4$ in (14). The first one can be eliminated shifting the field $\mathcal{X}$. The second one cannot be eliminated rearranging the fields. If the mass m_3 is larger than the supersymmetry breaking scale, ϕ_3 and ϕ_4 could be integrated out, supersymmetrically, recovering an accidental R -symmetry: this, however, is not our range of parameters.

We analyze the dynamics at the meta-stable vacuum where the breaking of supersymmetry generates a gaugino mass proportional to the breaking scale $F_{\mathcal{X}}$. Contribution to this mass comes from the superpotential⁵ of the messengers ϕ_i

$$W \supset h_2 (\mathcal{X}\phi_1\phi_2) + h_2 m_2 (\phi_2\phi_5 + \phi_1\phi_6) + h_1 m_2 (\phi_2\phi_3 + \phi_1\phi_4) + 2m_3\phi_3\phi_4 + \frac{h_1^2 m_1^2}{2m_3} \phi_1\phi_2 \quad (18)$$

which, in a matrix notation, reads

$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi_1 & \phi_3 & \phi_5 \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{M} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_2 \\ \phi_4 \\ \phi_6 \end{pmatrix} \quad (19)$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ is a mass matrix for the messenger fields

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} h_2 \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle + \frac{h_1^2 m_1^2}{2m_3} & h_1 m_2 & h_2 m_2 \\ h_1 m_2 & 2m_3 & 0 \\ h_2 m_2 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \equiv h_2 m_2 \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle}{m_2} + \zeta & \rho & 1 \\ \rho & \eta & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (20)$$

This matrix does not generate a gaugino mass at one loop at first order in $F_{\mathcal{X}}$ as in [28]. However at the third order in $F_{\mathcal{X}}$, the gaugino mass arises as in [20, 28]. This contribution is not negligible when $\frac{F_{\mathcal{X}}}{h_2^2 m_2^2} \sim 1$, which is admitted in our range of parameters.

Diagonalization of (20) and use of the general formula in [29] for the computation of the 1 loop diagrams contributing to the gaugino mass m_{λ} lead to

$$m_{\lambda} \sim \frac{F_{\mathcal{X}}^3}{(h_2 m_2)^5} \left[\frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle}{m_2} + \zeta \right) + \rho^2 \eta \right] \quad (21)$$

The coefficient of $F_{\mathcal{X}}^3$ in (21) is evaluated at the third order in the adimensional small parameters (ρ, η, ζ) : indeed by direct inspection we find that also the term $\left(\frac{\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle}{m_2} + \zeta \right)$ gives at least third order contributions in (η, ρ, ζ) .

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge K. Intriligator, R. Rattazzi, N. Seiberg and A.M. Uranga for stimulating discussions. This work has been supported in part by INFN, by PRIN prot.2005024045-002 and the European Commission RTN program MRTN-CT-2004-005104.

⁵For simplicity we consider only one copy of the chiral superpotentials.

References

- [1] K. Intriligator, N. Seiberg and D. Shih, JHEP **0604**, 021 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0602239].
- [2] S. Franco and A. M. Uranga, arXiv:hep-th/0604136.
- [3] H. Ooguri and Y. Ookouchi, arXiv:hep-th/0606061.
- [4] S. Ray, arXiv:hep-th/0607172.
- [5] A. Amariti, L. Girardello and A. Mariotti, arXiv:hep-th/0608063.
- [6] H. Ooguri and Y. Ookouchi, arXiv:hep-th/0607183.
- [7] S. Franco, I. Garcia-Etxebarria and A. M. Uranga, arXiv:hep-th/0607218.
- [8] I. Bena, E. Gorbatov, S. Hellerman, N. Seiberg and D. Shih, JHEP **0611** (2006) 088 [arXiv:hep-th/0608157].
- [9] C. Ahn, arXiv:hep-th/0608160.
- [10] R. Argurio, M. Bertolini, S. Franco and S. Kachru, arXiv:hep-th/0610212.
- [11] M. Aganagic, C. Beem, J. Seo and C. Vafa, arXiv:hep-th/0610249.
- [12] R. Tatar and B. Wetenhall, JHEP **0702** (2007) 020 [arXiv:hep-th/0611303].
- [13] E. Dudas, C. Papineau and S. Pokorski, arXiv:hep-th/0610297.
- [14] G. F. Giudice and R. Rattazzi, Phys. Rept. **322** (1999) 419 [arXiv:hep-ph/9801271].
- [15] M. Dine and W. Fischler, Nucl. Phys. B **204** (1982) 346.
M. Dine and W. Fischler, Phys. Lett. B **110** (1982) 227.
- [16] H. Murayama and Y. Nomura, arXiv:hep-ph/0612186.
- [17] M. Dine and J. Mason, arXiv:hep-ph/0611312.
M. Dine, J. L. Feng and E. Silverstein, Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006) 095012 [arXiv:hep-th/0608159].
- [18] R. Kitano, H. Ooguri and Y. Ookouchi, arXiv:hep-ph/0612139.
- [19] S. A. Abel and V. V. Khoze, arXiv:hep-ph/0701069.
- [20] C. Csaki, Y. Shirman and J. Terning, arXiv:hep-ph/0612241.
- [21] R. Kitano, Phys. Lett. B **641** (2006) 203 [arXiv:hep-ph/0607090].
M. Ibe and R. Kitano, arXiv:hep-ph/0611111.

- [22] O. Aharony and N. Seiberg, arXiv:hep-ph/0612308.
- [23] A. E. Nelson and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. B **416** (1994) 46 [arXiv:hep-ph/9309299].
- [24] D. Kutasov and A. Schwimmer, Phys. Lett. B **354**, 315 (1995) [arXiv:hep-th/9505004].
- [25] D. Kutasov, A. Schwimmer and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. B **459** (1996) 455 [arXiv:hep-th/9510222].
- [26] D. Kutasov, Phys. Lett. B **351**, 230 (1995) [arXiv:hep-th/9503086].
- [27] I. Affleck, M. Dine and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. B **241**, 493 (1984).
- [28] K. I. Izawa, Y. Nomura, K. Tobe and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997) 2886 [arXiv:hep-ph/9705228].
- [29] S. P. Martin, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 3177 [arXiv:hep-ph/9608224].